

# **MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

## **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

**DATE:**

October 28, 2003

**SUBJECT:**

2005 Population Options

**SUMMARY:**

In October 2002, the MAG Management Committee established a Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options to explore more cost-effective alternatives to a Special Census for deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenues to cities and towns. To create the opportunity to use other options, state law needed to be changed to allow for methods other than a Special Census. This year State law was amended to allow for the use of a Census Survey, or a July 1, 2005 Arizona Department of Economic Security Population estimate instead of a Special Census for distributing almost \$1 billion in state-shared revenue annually. After extensive deliberations during ten meetings held over a 10-month period, the MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options has recommended that MAG conduct a Census Survey, with a confidence interval of 95 percent plus/minus 2 percent, at a cost of \$9.4 million. Jurisdictions that wish to conduct a survey with the higher confidence interval – 95 percent plus/minus one percent, would be able to do so if they agreed to incur any additional local costs associated with the larger sample size.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has agreed to allow MAG to use FHWA Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to cover half the cost of the survey because of the data benefits offered by the survey, if all MAG member agencies agree to participate. The remaining \$4.7 million in survey costs would be allocated among MAG member agencies in accordance with the attached Table Three. The proposed Census Survey would be conducted in September 2005, and MAG would need to enter into an agreement with the Census Bureau by March 2004 to pursue this option. MAG member agencies would be billed for their share of the costs of the survey at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2006 (July 2005).

The efforts of the Subcommittee could not have been accomplished without the support and guidance of Census Bureau personnel in the Denver Regional Office and at Headquarters in Maryland.

On September 10, 2003, the Management Committee was briefed on the process followed to develop the recommendation and informed that the recommendation would be brought forth to the Management Committee and Regional Council for possible action in October. At the October Management Committee meeting it was requested that action on the recommendation be deferred to November to provide additional time for evaluation.

On October 24, 2003, a 2005 Population Options Workshop was held at MAG to review the process that the Subcommittee used to reach its recommendation. At the Workshop new tables were distributed showing the revenue implications of using a 2005 population figure based upon recently approved July 1, 2003 MAG estimates; and the potential costs that would be incurred to undertake a 2005 Census Survey or a 2005 Special Census. Those tables are attached.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

A citizen encouraged efforts to ensure he is counted in the Special Census.

**PROS & CONS:**

PROS: With about \$1 billion in state-shared revenue distributed annually, the rapid growth in the metropolitan area and the financial condition of member agencies, it is crucial to have a cost-effective method for deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenue.

CONS: Pursuing a Census Survey is less expensive than a Special Census but is subject to sampling error.

**TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

TECHNICAL: The logistics of carrying out a Census Survey for the region will be demanding, but will carry certain benefits of economies of scale and regional promotional activities to achieve participation and staffing.

POLICY: The 2005 population counts will be used to distribute more than \$1 billion annually in state-shared revenues between 2006 and 2010. The ability to use Federal Highway Administration funds to defray a portion of the cost of a Special Census or survey will require that the entire region pursue the Census Survey option.

**ACTION NEEDED:**

Recommend approval of the undertaking of a region-wide Census Survey with the \$9.4 million cost to be distributed to member agencies.

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:**

MAG Management Committee: On October 8, 2003, the Management Committee was briefed on the recommendation that was advanced by the Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options. It was requested that action be deferred until the November Management Committee meeting.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

Meredith Flinn for Terry Ellis, Peoria	Horatio Skeete, Litchfield Park
Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair, Mesa	Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
# George Hoffman, Apache Junction	Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
David Fitzhugh for Todd Hileman, Avondale	Cynthia Seelhammer, Queen Creek
Joe Blanton, Buckeye	* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Jon Pearson, Carefree	Indian Community
Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek	Steve Olson for Jan Dolan, Scottsdale
Pat McDermott, Chandler	Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise
Dick Yost, El Mirage	Shannon Wilhelmsen for Will Manley, Tempe
# Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills	Ralph Velez, Tolleson
* Don Steele, Gila Bend	Shane Dille, Wickenburg
Urban Giff, Gila River Indian Community	Mark Fooks, Youngtown
George Pettit, Gilbert	Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT
Dana Tranberg for Ed Beasley, Glendale	Tom Buick for David Smith, Maricopa County
* Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear	Ken Driggs, Valley Metro/RPTA
Tom Morales, Guadalupe	

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

MAG Management Committee: On September 10, 2003, the Management Committee was briefed on the recommendation that was advanced by the Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options and informed that the recommendation would be brought to the Management Committee and Regional Council for action in October.

**MEMBERS ATTENDING**

Terry Ellis, Peoria, Chair	Todd Hileman, Avondale
Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair, Mesa	Joe Blanton, Buckeye
#George Hoffman, Apache Junction	* Jon Pearson, Carefree

\* Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek  
 Pat McDermott, Chandler  
 Dick Yost, El Mirage  
 #Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills  
 Richard Stuart for Don Steele, Gila Bend  
 \* Urban Giff, Gila River Indian Community  
 George Pettit, Gilbert  
 Dana Tranberg for Ed Beasley, Glendale  
 Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear  
 Tom Morales, Guadalupe  
 Horatio Skeete, Litchfield Park  
 Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley  
 Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix  
 John Kross for Cynthia Seelhammer,

Queen Creek  
 Jacob Moore for Bryan Meyers, Salt  
 River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community  
 Roger Klingler for Jan Dolan,  
 Scottsdale  
 Phil Testa for Jim Rumpeltes, Surprise  
 Will Manley, Tempe  
 Ralph Velez, Tolleson  
 Shane Dille, Wickenburg  
 Mark Fooks, Youngtown  
 Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT  
 Tom Buick for David Smith,  
 Maricopa County  
 Ken Driggs, Valley Metro/RPTA

\*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

# Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options: On July 11, 2003, the MAG Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options recommended that MAG conduct a Census Survey for 2005 figures for distributing state shared revenue; and that the costs of the survey be allocated in accordance with the cost allocation table. MAG members that wish to conduct a survey with a higher confidence interval – 95 percent plus/minus 1 percent – would be able to do so if they agreed to incur the additional local costs associated with the larger sample size. The subcommittee unanimously agreed that there is a benefit to collecting regional information and updating Census data, but disagreement on the cost-allocation formula. The motion was recommended with one voting no (*italics*).

#### MEMBERS ATTENDING

George Pettit, Gilbert, Chairman  
*Charlie McClendon, Avondale*  
 Prisila Ferreira, Peoria

Norris Nordvold, Phoenix  
 Jim Huling, Mesa  
 \*Patrick Flynn, Tempe

\*Those members not present.

Management Committee: On October 14, 2002, the Management Committee approved establishment of a Subcommittee on 2005 population options to explore alternatives to deriving a 2005 population figure for distributing stated shared revenue.

#### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: Terry Ellis, Chairman  
 Mesa: Mike Hutchinson, Vice Chair  
 Apache Junction: Pat Brenner for  
 George Hoffman  
 Avondale: Kristin Greene Skabo for  
 Todd Hileman  
 \* Buckeye: Joe Blanton  
 Carefree: Jon Pearson  
 Cave Creek: Usama Abujbarah  
 Chandler: Patrice Kraus for Donna Dreska  
 El Mirage: Stuart Brackney  
 \* Fountain Hills: Tim Pickering  
 Gila Bend: Shane Dille  
 \* Gila River Indian Community: Urban Giff  
 Gilbert: Tami Ryall for George Pettit  
 Glendale: Ed Beasley  
 Goodyear: Stephen Cleveland

Guadalupe: Tom Morales  
 Litchfield Park: Horatio Skeete  
 Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen  
 Phoenix: Norris Nordvold for Frank Fairbanks  
 Queen Creek: Cynthia Seelhammer  
 \*Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:  
 Bryan Meyers  
 Scottsdale: Steve Olson for Jan Dolan  
 Surprise: Bill Pupo  
 Tempe: Amber Wakeman for Will Manley  
 Tolleson: Reyes Medrano for Ralph Velez  
 \*Wickenburg: Jerry Stricklin  
 Youngtown: Mark Fooks  
 ADOT: Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez  
 Maricopa County: Mike Sabatini for  
 David Smith  
 RPTA: Ken Driggs

\*Those members not present.

# Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

Regional Council: On April 24, 2002, the Regional Council approved reserving at least \$6 million of MAG federal funds over a four year period (\$1.5 million per year) to keep our options open regarding taking a 2005 Special Census or using an estimate and to forward an assessment schedule to the MAG member agencies reflecting \$24 million over a four year period. The motion was approved, with one voting no (*italics*).

#### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Peoria: Mayor John Keegan, Vice Chair  
Avondale: Mayor Ron Drake  
\* Buckeye: Mayor Dusty Hull  
\* Carefree: Mayor Edward C. Morgan  
\* Cave Creek: Vice Mayor Ralph Mozilo  
\* Chandler: Mayor Jay Tibshraeny  
El Mirage: Mayor Roy Delgado  
\* Fountain Hills: Mayor Sharon Morgan  
\* Gila Bend: Mayor Chuck Turner  
\* Gila River Indian Community: Governor Donald Antone  
Gilbert: Mayor Steven Berman  
Glendale: Mayor Elaine Scruggs  
Goodyear: Mayor Bill Arnold  
\* Guadalupe: Mayor Margarita Cota  
\* Litchfield Park: Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas  
Maricopa County: Supervisor Max W. Wilson  
for Supervisor Don Stapley  
\* Mesa: Mayor Keno Hawker

Paradise Valley: Mayor Edward Lowry  
*Phoenix: Councilmember Peggy Bilsten for Mayor Skip Rimsza*  
Queen Creek: Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr

\* Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: President Ivan Makil  
\* Scottsdale: Mayor Mary Manross  
Surprise: Mayor Joan Shafer  
\* Tempe: Mayor Neil Giuliano  
\* Tolleson: Mayor Adolfo Gamez  
Wickenburg: Mayor Lon McDermott  
Youngtown: Councilmember Lucille Retherford for Mayor Daphne Green  
ADOT: Joe Lane  
ADOT: Dallas Gant  
Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee: F. Rockne Arnett

\*Those members not present.

# Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

Management Committee: On April 10, 2002, the Management Committee recommended reserving at least \$6 million of MAG federal funds over a four year period (\$1.5 million per year) to keep our options open regarding taking a 2005 Special Census or to develop an estimate and to forward an assessment schedule to the MAG member agencies reflecting \$24 million over a four year period. The motion was recommended, with one abstention (shaded).

#### MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chairman  
Avondale: Kristin Greene for Scott Schrader  
\* Buckeye: Joe Blanton  
\* Carefree: Jon Pearson  
\* Cave Creek: Usama Abujbarah  
Chandler: Donna Dreska  
El Mirage: Stuart Brackney  
\* Fountain Hills: Paul Nordin  
Gila Bend: Shane Dille  
\* Gila River Indian Community: Urban Giff  
Gilbert: George Pettit  
Glendale: Tim Ernster for Ed Beasley  
Goodyear: Stephen Cleveland  
\* Guadalupe: Tom Morales  
\* Litchfield Park: Horatio Skeete

Mesa: Mike Hutchinson  
Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen  
Peoria: Terry Ellis  
Phoenix: Frank Fairbanks  
Queen Creek: Cynthia Seelhammer  
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: Jacob Moore for Bryan Meyers  
Scottsdale: Peggy Carpenter for Jan Dolan  
Surprise: Bill Pupo  
Tempe: Will Manley  
Tolleson: Ralph Velez  
\*Youngtown: Mark Fooks  
ADOT: Mary Lynn Tischer for Victor Mendez  
Maricopa County: Tom Buick for David Smith  
RPTA: Ken Driggs

\*Those members not present.

# Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

#### **CONTACT PERSON:**

George Pettit, Gilbert, (480) 503-6864  
Harry Wolfe, MAG, (602) 254-6300

## **MAG MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON 2005 POPULATION OPTIONS**

<b><u>Member</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>
George Pettit, Chair, Manager	Gilbert
Prisila Ferreira, Vice Chair, Deputy City Manager	Peoria
Charlie McClendon, Assistant City Manager	Avondale
Jim Huling, Assistant to the City Manager	Mesa
Norris Nordvold, Intergovernmental Programs Director	Phoenix
Patrick Flynn, Assistant City Manager	Tempe

October 28, 2003

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: George A. Pettit, Chair  
Management Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION ON 2005 POPULATION OPTIONS FOR  
DISTRIBUTING STATE SHARED REVENUES

Almost \$1 billion in state-shared revenues is distributed annually to local governments throughout Arizona using population as one part of the distribution formula. This includes state shared income tax, sales tax, gasoline tax, and vehicle license tax. Lottery funds are distributed based on annual population estimates prepared by DES and approved by the Economic Estimates Commission. State law provides for the population to be changed on all other distributions using only the Decennial Census, or a mid-decade Special Census.

The 2003 Legislative session approved an amendment to State Law which would allow for use of the following options for distributing state-shared revenues:

- Census Survey
- Arizona Department of Economic Security population estimate
- Special Census
- Retaining 2000 Census population counts

Because of the rapid growth of the MAG Region, member agencies opted in 1985, and again in 1995 to conduct a Special Census to provide updated population data for the state-shared revenue formulas. Although the cost of a Decennial Census is paid by the federal government, the costs of a Special Census must be paid by the contracting local governments. In 1985 the cost of the Special Census to MAG member agencies was approximately \$3.5 million. The 1995 Special Census cost approximately \$9 million, with half paid by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. FHWA approved use of the funds to provide updated data to use for transportation modeling efforts in the rapidly growing urban area. Estimates on the cost of a Special Census at this time are \$31 million, based upon an estimated 3.6 million persons to be counted in the region. If all MAG member agencies agreed to participate in the Special Census \$6 million in FHWA funds could be made available, making the net costs to member agencies \$25 million for a Special Census.

In October 2002, the MAG Management Committee established a Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options to explore the advantages and disadvantages for deriving a 2005 population number for distributing state-shared revenues. The objective of the Committee was to seek a "regional solution" for obtaining a 2005 population figure for distributing state-shared revenues to take advantage of the \$6 million in FHWA

revenue that would be made available to defray the cost if all member agencies agreed to pursue the same option (a Special Census or a Census Survey).

George Pettit, Chairman of the MAG Population Technical Advisory Committee and Manager of Gilbert, served as the Chair of the Subcommittee and Prisila Ferreira, Deputy Manager of Peoria, served as the Vice Chair. Managers/Intergovernmental Coordinators of Tempe, Mesa, Avondale and Phoenix also served on the Subcommittee.

Between October 2002 and July 2003, the Subcommittee met ten times to discuss and evaluate a range of options for a 2005 population number. The 2005 population was estimated for each city and town by taking the average annual percentage growth between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2002 from the DES/MAG population estimates, and assuming the growth rate continued through October 2005. The one exception was for the City of El Mirage. Its average annual growth rate was capped at 30%, because its average annual growth rate for the period in question was unlikely to be sustained over the 5.5 year period within the existing corporate limits. Draft July 1, 2003 population estimates have recently been substituted for jurisdictions within Maricopa County.

Each option explored by the Subcommittee is presented as follows:

#### Census Survey

A Census Survey is a statistical sampling of the households in a community sufficient to secure enough data to statistically derive the total population.

The Census Bureau has indicated the cost of a Survey with a 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 2 percent would be \$9.4 million, assuming a 50 percent mail response rate. If the response rate is lower, then additional costs for enumerators to make follow up visits to secure the information will be added. If the response rate is higher, then the costs could decrease. The cost of a 95 percent confidence interval plus or minus 1 percent approached \$20 million.

An extensive amount of time was spent examining the proper accuracy level to use for the Survey. The Subcommittee worked with the Census Bureau and examined two options, a 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 2 percent and a 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 1 percent. The Subcommittee recommendation is to use the 95 percent, plus or minus 2 percent Survey.

The Census Bureau calculated the size of the sample for each jurisdiction based upon the following factors:

- The reliability factor (i.e. 95 percent confidence interval plus/minus 2 percent)
- The variation in the number of persons per housing unit across all units in the jurisdiction
- The size of the sample relative to the total housing units in a jurisdiction.
- The number of samples taken (one for each jurisdiction, except Mesa and Phoenix. Those jurisdictions requested that two and five subregions within their jurisdiction be sampled respectively.)

One of the major underlying concerns of the Subcommittee was accuracy and completeness of a Survey. As a by-product of that concern, Group Quarters (dormitories, prisons, nursing homes, and the homeless) were recommended to receive a full count, rather than Survey. This cost is included in the \$9.4 million estimated total cost.

The Census Survey is a more cost effective approach than a Special Census to secure updated population information.

#### DES Estimate

The Subcommittee recognized that the DES Estimate approach would cost the least. There would be no cost assuming that no surveys were conducted in connection with the estimate. However, the estimate uses completed housing units as a source of estimating population, as well as Census 2000 base data, and does not provide any updated information on the characteristics of the community such as vacancy rates and household size. Therefore the 2000 vacancy rate and household size would likely be used for the 2005 estimate.

Other concerns with the use of an estimate included: the availability and reliability of the necessary input data; potential for underestimating population of MAG member agencies based upon experience in 1990, 1995 and 2000; uncertainty over the methods that would be used to derive the 2005 population estimates and the application of these methods.

#### Special Census

The Subcommittee determined that the cost/benefit of conducting a Regional Special Census was not realistic or affordable. The \$31 million estimated cost is prohibitive when viewed in terms of other priorities in this economic climate. Additionally a Special Census involves having a Census enumerator visit each household in Mariposa County. The logistical concerns over recruiting sufficient staff to conduct a door to door census for the entire region was also of concern.

#### Retaining 2000 Population

There was little discussion on this option, since most communities in the region are continuing to grow. However, we recognize the value to communities who might experience population decline in the rest of the State.

The Subcommittee unanimously recommended the use of a Census Survey to derive 2005 population figures for the Region.

#### Cost Distribution Formula

The costs of the previous Special Census were distributed on a per capita basis, since there was a relationship between the costs of collecting the information based upon the number of persons being counted.



However, as the Committee reviewed the technical sampling and relative costs of a survey to collect information to achieve the statistical accuracy, a discussion on the cost distribution formula resulted. In some cases, the number of housing units required to sample smaller communities approached or exceeded the cost of a Special Census, while statistical accurate sampling was less costly in larger communities.

The final compromise formula recommended by the Subcommittee uses a blending of allocating costs on a per capita basis for communities with less than 6,000 population and a projected growth rate of less than 3.5 percent and on a housing unit sample size for all other communities. In no case would the costs of the Survey 95 percent confidence interval, plus or minus 2 percent exceed the cost of a Special Census.

The Subcommittee further recommended that if a jurisdiction chose to use a 95 percent confidence interval plus/minus 1 percent, it could do so as long as it paid the additional associated costs of the survey after the federal share was applied to the extent that federal funds remained available. (FHWA indicated a maximum federal contribution of \$6 million.) The costs noted do not include the additional costs associated with promotion and local efforts to assure that the return rate of the surveys is achieved.

The Subcommittee had one dissenting opinion on the cost allocation formula. The preference was to stay with the allocation formula recommended.

### Timing

The Office of Special Census has indicated that MAG needs to enter into an Agreement for a Census Survey by March, 2004. All member agencies would have to agree to participate in the Survey, in order to allow for half the cost of the Survey to be covered by FHWA funds.

The Survey would be conducted in September, 2005. The change in population distribution would be effective July, 2006 for the 2006-07 Fiscal Year and would continue to be used for distributing state-shared revenue until the 2010 Decennial Census.

The Subcommittee recommendation was presented to the Management Committee for information and discussion in September and October of 2003. If all agencies participate, MAG would use the FHWA funds to cover the initial costs of the Survey (15 percent of costs due in March 2004 and 5 percent due in June 2004), and then invoice member agencies for their share of the projected costs in June 2005. The final costs would be allocated in accordance with the recommended formula and actual population derived.

On October 24, 2003 MAG held a Workshop on 2005 Population Options to explain the process by which the Subcommittee reached its recommendation and to respond to questions. At the Workshop tables were distributed showing the revenue implications of using a 2005 population figure based upon growth rates between April 1, 2000 and the July 1, 2003 MAG Resident Population Estimates approved by the MAG Regional Council on October 22, 2003; and the potential costs that would be incurred to undertake a 2005 Census Survey or a 2005 Special Census. Those tables are attached.

The Management Committee will be considering the recommendation of the Subcommittee on 2005 Population Options on November 5, 2003.

**Table 1**  
**Population Data and Housing Sample Size**  
**Used to Derive the Cost of the Special Census**  
**and the Census Survey with a 95% Confidence Interval Plus/Minus 2 Percent**

Jurisdiction	2% Housing Unit Sample Size	Number of Samples	Population April 1, 2000	Population July 1, 2003	Annual Growth	Estimated Population October 2005
Avondale	3,180	1	35,883	54,100	13.47%	71,900
Buckeye	2,935	1	8,497	13,050	14.11%	17,600
Carefree	1,625	1	2,927	3,225	3.03%	3,400
Cave Creek	1,440	1	3,728	4,155	3.39%	4,500
Chandler	4,635	1	176,581	208,760	5.29%	234,400
El Mirage	4,395	1	7,609	25,505	30.00%	32,200
Fountain Hills	3,610	1	20,235	22,120	2.78%	23,500
Gila Bend	700	1	1,980	2,025	0.69%	2,100
Gilbert	3,360	1	109,697	151,695	10.49%	189,900
Glendale	4,660	1	218,812	230,730	1.65%	239,400
Goodyear	3,225	1	18,911	30,395	15.72%	42,200
Guadalupe	925	1	5,228	5,330	0.60%	5,400
Litchfield Park	1,180	1	3,810	3,870	0.48%	3,900
Mesa	13,850	2	396,375	434,585	2.87%	463,200
Paradise Valley	2,275	1	13,664	14,220	1.23%	14,600
Peoria	4,700	1	108,364	126,585	4.90%	141,000
Phoenix	27,250	5	1,321,045	1,388,310	1.54%	1,436,900
Queen Creek	1,295	1	4,316	7,510	18.58%	11,000
Scottsdale	5,980	1	202,705	217,695	2.22%	228,700
Surprise	6,360	1	30,848	51,790	17.28%	74,100
Tempe	4,725	1	158,625	159,620	0.19%	160,300
Tolleson	1,075	1	4,974	5,420	2.68%	5,800
Wickenburg	2,015	1	5,082	5,690	3.54%	6,200
Youngtown	1,555	1	3,010	3,675	6.33%	4,200
Balance of County	7,430	1	209,090	229,493	2.91%	244,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>114,380</b>		<b>3,071,996</b>	<b>3,399,553</b>	<b>3.17%</b>	<b>3,661,200</b>

Notes:

**The annual growth is based upon growth in DES/MAG population estimates between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2003. These numbers are draft and subject to change.**

Balance of County = Unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community.

These numbers include calculations for the portions of Queen Creek and Peoria outside of Maricopa County

Unless all member agencies decide to go for a Census Survey or all member agencies decide to go for a Special Census, FHWA funds will not be available

Apache Junction has requested that the City be included in the Census Survey. The Census Bureau has been requested to estimate the sample size and the cost of such a survey

State-shared revenues to cities and towns assumed to be \$985 million annually

Average annual growth rate capped at 30 percent

Numbers may not add due to rounding

**Table 2**  
**State Shared Revenue Based on 2000 and 2005 Population**  
**and Annual Differences in Revenue**

Jurisdiction*	Census 2000	DES/MAG July 1, 2003	Annual Growth	Estimated October 2005	Estimated SSR 2000	Estimated SSR 2005	Difference
El Mirage	7,609	25,505	30.00%	32,200	\$1,852,000	\$6,709,000	\$4,857,000
Queen Creek	4,316	7,510	18.58%	11,000	\$1,051,000	\$2,295,000	\$1,244,000
Surprise	30,848	51,790	17.28%	74,100	\$7,508,000	\$15,442,000	\$7,934,000
Goodyear	18,911	30,395	15.72%	42,200	\$4,603,000	\$8,793,000	\$4,190,000
Buckeye	8,497	13,050	14.10%	17,600	\$2,069,000	\$3,657,000	\$1,588,000
Avondale	35,883	54,100	13.47%	71,900	\$8,734,000	\$14,973,000	\$6,239,000
Gilbert	109,697	151,695	10.49%	189,900	\$26,701,000	\$39,545,000	\$12,844,000
Youngtown	3,010	3,675	6.33%	4,200	\$733,000	\$879,000	\$146,000
Chandler	176,581	208,760	5.29%	234,400	\$42,980,000	\$48,825,000	\$5,845,000
Peoria	108,364	126,585	4.90%	141,000	\$26,376,000	\$29,361,000	\$2,985,000
Wickenburg	5,082	5,690	3.54%	6,200	\$1,237,000	\$1,282,000	\$45,000
Cave Creek	3,728	4,155	3.39%	4,500	\$907,000	\$933,000	\$26,000
Carefree	2,927	3,225	3.03%	3,400	\$712,000	\$718,000	\$6,000
Balance of County*	209,090	229,493	2.91%	244,800	*	*	*
Mesa	396,375	434,585	2.87%	463,200	\$96,479,000	\$96,473,000	(\$6,000)
Fountain Hills	20,235	22,120	2.78%	23,500	\$4,925,000	\$4,900,000	(\$25,000)
Tolleson	4,974	5,420	2.68%	5,800	\$1,211,000	\$1,198,000	(\$13,000)
Apache Junction	31,814	33,569	2.42%	36,500	\$7,744,000	\$7,257,000	(\$487,000)
Scottsdale	202,705	217,695	2.22%	228,700	\$49,339,000	\$47,639,000	(\$1,700,000)
Glendale	218,812	230,730	1.65%	239,400	\$53,259,000	\$49,855,000	(\$3,404,000)
Phoenix	1,321,045	1,388,310	1.54%	1,436,900	\$321,546,000	\$299,282,000	(\$22,264,000)
Paradise Valley	13,664	14,220	1.23%	14,600	\$3,326,000	\$3,045,000	(\$281,000)
Gila Bend	1,980	2,025	0.69%	2,100	\$482,000	\$428,000	(\$54,000)
Guadalupe	5,228	5,330	0.60%	5,400	\$1,273,000	\$1,125,000	(\$148,000)
Litchfield Park	3,810	3,870	0.48%	3,900	\$927,000	\$815,000	(\$112,000)
Tempe	158,625	159,620	0.19%	160,300	\$38,610,000	\$33,391,000	(\$5,219,000)

Notes:

The distribution of state-shared revenues to counties uses population growth to a lesser degree than for cities and towns, making it difficult to predict the impact of using a 2005 population figure versus using 2000.

**The annual growth is based upon growth in DES/MAG population estimates between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2003. These numbers are draft and subject to change.**

Balance of County = Unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

These numbers include calculations for the portions of Queen Creek and Peoria outside of Maricopa County

Apache Junction has requested that the City be included in the Census Survey. The Census Bureau has been requested to estimate the sample size and the cost of such a survey

State-shared revenues to cities and towns assumed to be \$985 million annually

Average annual growth rate capped at 30 percent

Numbers may not add due to rounding

**Table 3**  
**Cost of the Census Survey Using 95% Confidence Interval Plus/Minus 2**  
**Percent and Cost of Special Census**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Net Survey Cost (after FHWA contribution)*</b>	<b>Net 2005 Special Census Cost Based on Share of 2005 Population (after FHWA contribution)*</b>
Avondale	\$130,700	\$490,900
Buckeye	\$119,900	\$119,900
Carefree	\$4,400	\$23,600
Cave Creek	\$5,700	\$30,600
Chandler	\$220,200	\$1,600,700
El Mirage	\$180,600	\$220,000
Fountain Hills	\$148,300	\$160,700
Gila Bend	\$2,600	\$14,000
Gilbert	\$138,100	\$1,296,500
Glendale	\$221,900	\$1,634,500
Goodyear	\$132,500	\$288,300
Guadalupe	\$6,900	\$36,900
Litchfield Park	\$5,000	\$26,700
Mesa	\$627,800	\$3,162,900
Paradise Valley	\$93,500	\$99,800
Peoria	\$193,100	\$962,600
Phoenix	\$1,301,900	\$9,811,900
Queen Creek	\$53,200	\$75,300
Scottsdale	\$274,700	\$1,561,800
Surprise	\$261,300	\$506,200
Tempe	\$194,200	\$1,094,700
Tolleson	\$7,400	\$39,300
Wickenburg	\$42,000	\$42,000
Youngtown	\$28,800	\$28,800
Balance of County	\$305,300	\$1,671,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,700,000</b>	<b>\$25,000,000</b>

Notes:

The annual growth is based upon growth in DES/MAG population estimates between April 1, 2000 and June 30, 2003. These numbers are draft and subject to change.

Balance of County = Unincorporated areas, Gila River Indian Community and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

These numbers include calculations for the portions of Queen Creek and Peoria outside of Maricopa County

Unless all member agencies decide to go for a Census Survey or all member agencies decide to go for a Special Census, FHWA funds will not be available

Apache Junction has requested that the City be included in the Census Survey. The Census Bureau has been requested to estimate the sample size and the cost of such a survey

State-shared revenues to cities and towns assumed to be \$985 million annually

Average annual growth rate capped at 30 percent

Numbers may not add due to rounding